DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 479 648 CS 512 442

AUTHOR	Palmer, David L.
TITLE	Teaching the "Pedagogy of Civic Action": Toward a Rhetorical Democratic Pedagogy.
PUB DATE	2002-11-00
NOTE	16p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the National Communication Association (88th, New Orleans, LA, November 21-24, 2002).
PUB TYPE	Opinion Papers (120) -- Speeches/Meeting Papers (150)
EDRS PRICE	EDRS Price MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	*Academic Standards; Citizenship Education; *Democracy; Elementary Secondary Education; Higher Education; Models; *Speech Curriculum; *Speech Instruction; State Standards; *Teacher Education

ABSTRACT

This paper addresses the question: how might those engaged in the mission of training secondary Speech-education teachers create a "pedagogy of authentic civic action" in light of current standards legislation that functions more to perpetuate a liberal republic than it does to vivify (and articulate) an authentic democracy? The arena of K-12 education in the U.S. (including Speech education) is in the midst of an extensive standardization movement. State standards increasingly cast both the practices of secondary Speech-education and the training of Speech teachers. Relevant here is that Speech-education standards lack any mention of democracy or civic participation, a decision that, in essence, impedes teachers from engaging these projects. In contrast, it is noteworthy that the formal genesis of democracy and education theory is directly coupled to the birth of rhetoric (or Speech). Concurrently, Civics standards employ the language of rhetoric, yet ignore its discipline and its pedagogy. The work argues that current standards, while valuable in many ways, limit the vision of civics and democracy to the extent that they embrace a set of sterilized Speech standards. The piece calls for a revised set of rhetoric-based benchmarks designed to invigorate an authentic democracy model of education. A contrast between existing standards and an alternative civics-as-rhetoric curriculum is outlined. Finally, an initial theory of a "pedagogy of strong democracy" based in the study and practices of Speech (or rhetoric) is proposed. (Contains 20 references.) (Author/RS)

Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made
from the original document.

ED 479 648

Teaching the "Pedagogy of Civic Action"

Toward a Rhetorical Democratic Pedagogy

David L. Palmer, Ph.D.
University of Northern Colorado
Department of Communication and Rhetoric

--presented at--

The 53rd Annual Meeting Of NCA
The National Communication Association

PANEL: **Communication Pedagogy and Democratic Action**

New Orleans
2002

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

D. L. Palmer

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

1

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☐ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

Direct Correspondence to:
David L. Palmer, Ph.D.
1245A Candelaria Hall
Department of Communication & Rhetoric
The University of Northern Colorado
Greeley, CO 80639

970.351.2800
dlpalme@bentley.unco.edu
www..unco.edu/democracy.com

CS 512 442

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Teaching the "Pedagogy of Civic Action"

Toward a Rhetorical Democratic Pedagogy

David L. Palmer, Ph.D.
University of Northern Colorado

National Communication Association:
New Orleans, LA : 2002

ABSTRACT

This paper addresses the question: how might those engaged in the mission of training secondary Speech-education teachers create a "pedagogy of authentic civic action" in light of current standards legislation that functions more to perpetuate a liberal republic than it does to vivify (and articulate) an authentic democracy?

The arena of K-12 education in the U.S. (including Speech education) is in the midst of an extensive standardization movement. State standards increasingly cast both the practices of secondary Speech-education and the training of Speech teachers. Relevant here is that Speech-education standards lack any mention of democracy or civic participation—a decision that, in essence, impedes teachers from engaging these projects. In contrast, it is noteworthy that the formal genesis of democracy and education theory is directly coupled to the birth of rhetoric (or Speech). Concurrently, Civics standards employ the language of rhetoric, yet ignore its discipline and its pedagogy. The work argues that current standards, while valuable in many ways, limit the vision of civics and democracy to the extent that they embrace a set of sterilized Speech standards. The piece calls for a revised set of rhetoric-based benchmarks designed to invigorate an authentic democracy model of education. A contrast between existing standards and an alternative civics-as-rhetoric curriculum is outlined. Finally, an initial theory of a "pedagogy of strong democracy" based in the study and practices of Speech (or rhetoric) is proposed.

Teaching the "Pedagogy of Civic Action"

Toward a Rhetorical Democratic Pedagogy

"To rule well they need first to rule"
--Barber (Strong Democracy)

The U.S. education system is in the midst of an extensive standardization movement. Drawing from national trends, state education boards now meticulously script K-12 curricula and teaching standards in the endeavor to boost student performance levels in core content areas. Institutions dedicated to training K-12 teachers have also come under the auspices of the academic standards project. The National Committee for the Accreditation of Teacher Education, for example, rules on the viability of a teacher-training program in direct relation to state and national standards. In essence, the curricula cast and regulated by education agencies make-up the benchmarks for the practices of K-12 education and the training of K-12 teachers (e.g., Harnischfeger, 200?)

The present study examines how the standards movement shapes (both positively and negatively) the education of secondary Speech teachers and their students. The idea of the liberal arts student originates in the study of rhetoric, and the practices of public influence are the engines that propel culture. How K-12 students are acclimated to Speech (and rhetoric) within the standards movement is worth concerted attention.

In general, communication scholars have responded to the standards movement both by adopting it and by calling for a cross-curriculum focus on the primacy of symbolic activity in human affairs (e.g., Hunt, Simonds & Cooper, 2002). Yet, it is notable is that the standardization of Speech-education is not directed by the speech-communication discipline, but by state legislation in English. Simply put, Speech standards are English standards. The prime focus here is (not surprisingly) composition. The programs of Massachusetts and California, which are among the most touted, are reading and writing curricula that lightly mention public speech. Under English, Speech standards focus students on the composition and performance procedures of genre speeches, and the curriculum archetype is a basic Aristotelian model of effective message construction. These standards are valuable in that they help cultivate basic skills in speech composition and presentation.

Yet, current standards entrench convention that Speech-education is a mere skills project with no viable content beyond English. The standards simply ignore analysis of the history and theory of rhetoric. In addition, English standards lack any mention of democracy or civics--a decision that impedes teachers from engaging these projects. In contrast, it is noteworthy that the formal genesis of democracy, civics and education theory is directly coupled to the birth of rhetoric (or Speech).

The current study is a critical analysis of the current content standards that guide teacher training curricula in English and Civics. Two basic claims organize the paper. First, the work argues that current state standards, while valuable in many ways, limit the vision of civics and democracy to the extent that they accept a set of sterilized Speech standards. Second, the piece argues that a revised set of rhetoric-based standards will function to invigorate an authentic democratic model of education. The work contrasts existing standards with an alternative civics-as-rhetoric education model.

The piece is divided into four sections. The first section outlines a brief history of the K-12 standards movement in the United States. The second section examines Speech standards as derived from English standards. The third section outlines how civics and democracy are discussed in the standards project. The final section outlines a revised set of rhetoric-based standards and posits a theory of a pedagogy of strong democracy based in Speech-education.

A Brief History of the K-12 Standards Movement

For almost two centuries of U.S. history , the federal government maintained only a light connection to the education arena. The latter part of the 20th century, however, gave rise to events that increasingly brought the two together. The Supreme Court rulings of the 1950s followed by the 1960s education legislation of Johnson's Great Society functioned to deepen the ties between federal agencies and classrooms across the U.S.

The genesis of the current standards project is located in the broad response to T.H. Bell's prominent 1981 "Nation at Risk" report on the state of U.S. education. The report describes a crisis in the U.S. rooted in poor K-12 achievement levels in specific content areas. Bell argued that sub-standard performance in these areas translates into deficient global achievement in the areas of industry, commerce and the military (Stanley & Nelson, 1994).

Bell's augury spawned a decade of reports and agencies that examined the quality of education in the U.S. (Stanley & Nelson, 1994). This trend compelled the Bush/Clinton administrations to enact strident remedies to the performance-level problem. The central reform plan was the standards-based project. In essence, standards operate by outlining in detail education objectives and key behavioral indicators at specific student development stages in content areas. The project concurrently mandates that teachers design their curricula and pedagogy such that their students "make the mark."

A host of federal and state education agencies, national societies and academies set about the task of fulfilling the goals outlined at the federal level. Drawing upon national trends, each state crafts its own standards regimen. The project is annually assessed through standards testing at the K-12 level and by accreditation bodies such as NCATE. The broad project has met with mixed reviews. Those who support it point to increases in student performance levels in specific content areas. Those who oppose it tend to criticize both the homgenization of student outcomes and the expansion of federal power over the texture and goals of education curricula (e.g., Eisner, 1995).

Speech Standards as English Standards

One of the more striking details of the standardization project is the fact that Speech standards do not maintain a unique standing. Instead, they are derived directly from national and state English standards. Simply put, Speech standards are English standards. The origin of this content regimen resides in the National Association for the Teachers of English, the forum for trends and debate concerning English curricula and pedagogical designs.

In essence, state and national agencies have decided that Speech as a content area has no viable significance beyond English. This decision is predictable given that the norm in K-12 education is to combine English and Speech—a bond grounded in the study of

rhetoric as it was cast during the inception of U.S. higher education. During the 19th and early part of the 20th centuries, the study of rhetoric was subsumed within the English discipline. Based in Enlightenment thought, which seeks to craft a scientific language void of its value-laden and subjective qualities, 19th century rhetoric was gutted of its political and critical overtones and simply denoted the practices of effective message construction.

Rhetoricians weary of disciplinary colonization mutinied from English in 1914. The result was the foundation in 1950 of the Speech Communication Association (now NCA). Under the auspices of NCA, rhetoricians have reclaimed their political and critical origins; and a rich body of literature concerning ideology, culture and influence has ensued.

Yet, educators and their political counterparts in the standards movement simply ignore the unique nature of rhetoric beyond English. Under the rubric of language arts, the trend is to focus the student on reading and writing as well as composition and speaking procedures. Basic themes in English standards include reading, writing, grammar, research and evaluation skills (see appendix 1.1) Speech curriculum translated through English is simply the latter two/fifths of Aristotle's five canons: invention, arrangement, style, memory and delivery. Here, speech is simply argument construction plus delivery skills.

The current framework has both advantages and disadvantages. It is productive, for example, that the Speech student is encouraged to discern basic features of arguments, evidence, sequencing and composition. Secondary Speech texts are essentially taxonomies of strategies conducive to elementary speech construction (e.g., Verdeber, 1999). The basic skills of speech formation and presentation are invaluable tools in social affairs.

Yet, despite standards-based strategies that increase student knowledge and skills in the area of speech composition and classroom delivery, two dubious issues emerge within the English-Speech project. First, standards and content in this area lack any mention of democracy, civics or political action— a decision that impedes teachers and students from pursuing these projects. A review of current state standards corroborates this claim (see appendix). In addition, Speech texts are devoid of civic or political content (e.g., Verdeber, 1999) Rooted in the 19th century model of rhetoric as the mere skills of effective message construction, current English standards gut Speech of its original function of creating politically sophisticated advocates trained to engage the democratic order.

Second, current standards do little to encourage structural application of speech content. English standards are preparatory in nature. They are designed to prepare students for future compositional/speaking obligations. Despite the fact that state standards mention speaking to various audiences, curriculum development under the standards movement fails to provide a systemic program that connects the student-as-speaker to cultural forums wherein s/he can apply the skills and content learned in the classroom. In addition, there is no attempt to integrate civic participation literature or teacher training in the arena of Speech education.

In essence, current standards are geared more toward training efficient speakers for a liberal democracy than cultivating civic rhetoricians with substantive ties to the democratic order. In practice, teachers are little more than composition and performance critics, and the student's classroom is the only forum of activity. Yet, it is this programmatic system of study that receives funding and attention under the standards movement.

Civics and Democracy in State Standards

There is a concerted effort in the standards movement to create an informed and active citizenry. The locus of this project resides in the broad area of the Social Sciences, where one finds the standards concerning civics and democracy. The national body that spearheads this movement is the Center for Civic Education— which is both informed by the extensive democracy and education literature and which takes its current direction from the Goals 2000: Educate America Act. In the preface to the center's National Standards for Civics and Government it states:

> It has been recognized since the founding of the nation that education has a civic mission: to prepare informed, rational, humane, and participating citizens committed to the values and principles of American constitutional democracy.

The mission expressed by the center is echoed in virtually all state Civics standards. Schools share a charge to prepare informed and skilled participants in the constitutional republic. Barbour (2002) encapsulates this idea as he states that the "ideal democratic citizen understands how government works, who the main actors are, and what major principles underlie the operation of the political system" (p283).

The norm for states is to own a set of Civics standards that are shared by various disciplines at the higher education level (e.g., History and Economics) and are relegated to Social Studies at the secondary level. The focus in civics standards is on cultivating intellectual and participatory knowledge and skills vis-à-vis the constitutional republic.

Basic themes in the intellectual domain include understanding government, the U.S. constitutional republic, its civic-citizen features, and the relationship of the U.S. to its geo-political environment (see appendix). Basic themes in the participatory lexicon include understanding how citizens exercise civic roles, rights and responsibilities within the social order. The primary stated goal of these projects is to "ensure that the constitutional republic of the United States is preserved." These goals manifest in teacher-education as candidates in the social sciences are taught the framework of civics standards.

Examination of how Civics standards function in teacher education programs reveals two vital themes. First, despite the fact that Civics standards resolutely employ the language of rhetoric, teacher education in civics neither engages the discipline of rhetoric nor adheres its vast civic project to Speech teacher education. Second, the language of the constitutional republic that permeates standards does little to encourage authentic civic participation. The focus rests, instead, on the student understanding (as a cultural critic might) the nature and processes of the republic. The ensuing sections evaluate these themes in turn.

First, there is a concerted project in the civics standards to cultivate the student as political advocate. As such, Civics standards are saturated with the language of rhetoric and citizenry proper is cast as co-extensive with the practices of rhetoric. The National Standards for Civics and Government, for example, declare that effective influence is central to proper citizenship. Students, for example, are required to take and defend positions, evaluate evidence, assess persuasive strategies, testify before public bodies, examine interest-serving discourse in the media and the like.

Yet, despite this depiction, Civics standards simply ignore the political and practical theories of rhetoric. There is no reference to the origins of civics and democracy as it is historically encapsulated by rhetoric. And, there is no attempt to cross-fertilize civic action with modern rhetorical theory and pedagogy. The unfortunate result is that there is little attempt across state standards projects to bind the goals of Civics to the goals of Speech. As

such, the civics project cripples itself as it ignores the theoretical and practical discipline required to fulfill its own stated civic education goals.

Second, the language of the constitutional republic that permeates standards does little to encourage authentic civic participation. The focus rests, instead, on understanding and evaluating (as a cultural critic might) the nature and processes of the republic. A brief review of the verbs that frame standard elements reveals this process. In reference to the issues of civic participation, one finds a linguistic framework of understanding, examining, exploring, evaluating and analyzing features of the civic arena.

New York standards, for example, claim that "central to civics and citizenship is an understanding of the roles of the citizen within American constitutional democracy and the scope of a citizen's rights and responsibilities." (Standard 5). California standards (12.3-1) encourage students to "explain how civil society provides opportunities for individuals to associate for social, cultural, religious, economic, and political purposes." And Virginia standards (GOVT.9) declare that:

> ... the student will demonstrate knowledge of the process by which public policy is made by a) examining different perspectives on the role of government; b) explaining how local, state, and national governments formulate public policy; c) describing the processes by which policy is implemented by the bureaucracy at each level; and d) analyzing how individuals, interest groups, and the media influence public policy."

Given such language, there is little question that the Civics project encourages understanding and evaluation of the system of American government. Yet, there is scant evidence that the Civics standards project and its subsequent teacher education curriculum (actually) promote direct activity in the social order. Instead, participatory skills are couched primarily in what I call here critic/mimic terminology. That is, students are encouraged within the standards framework to understand, evaluate and emulate democratic processes. The National Standards for Civics and Government, for example, encourages students to "take part in simulations of the activities of government and private sector agencies and organizations (p.9). Colorado standards echo this sentiment in their primary standard 4, which states that students should work to "understand how citizens exercise the roles, rights and responsibilities of participation in civic life at all levels— local, state and national."

Admittedly, there does exist language in the national standards that calls for student participation in the democratic order. These prescriptions suggest that students should "meet with members of government to advocate their positions" and "testify before public bodies" (National Standards p.9). Yet, aside from the occasional adventurous teacher determined to engage these projects, little is done systematically to encourage teachers and student teachers to promote direct action. In addition, the language of actual participation in the national standards is seldom echoed in state standards— which tend to employ almost solely the critic/mimic stance of civic education (see, for example, California, Massachusetts, Colorado and Virginia standards). As a result, structural ties between students and active government bodies are spurious at best.

Bowles and Gintis (1993) state, "the historical viability of a commitment to democracy flows from the dominance of the discourse of rights in the context of a set of rules of the game" (p.87). The participating citizen is framed in what Barber (1984) deems "thin democracy" terms. That is, students are inculcated not into an ontology of authentic democratic action, but into a framework of citizen as evaluating critic. Democratic participation is couched in terms of understanding and evaluation government procedures, voting, writing editors and contacting members of the government. In essence, this process constitutes a thin project to engage and vivify authentic democratic action.

The Civics project constitutes more of a review of how, in theory, a democratic republic should play out. There is little attempt, in practice, to integrate the student into the body politic and there is little in secondary education curriculum to vivify civic action. Put simply, the focus here is on learning and not doing. As Shanker (199?) states:

> ... [a] challenge to sound education for democracy programs is posed by the contention that what matters in teaching democratic citizenship is the teaching of critical thinking skills, and little else. Closely related to this is the attitude that considers all curricular content to be equal, and champions the position that all that is required of students to be good citizens is that they learn how to learn."(p. 3)

A Rhetorical-Democratic Education

The relationship between democracy, education and public speech was first formally explored in the rhetoric and philosophy traditions of Athenian Greece. Athens was the first democratic experiment, and its fate became tied to rhetoric in the great education theories of the day (Jaeger, 1970). The Paideiea, in particular--or rhetorical theory of pedagogy— which was the first curriculum to explore the discursive citizen in relation to the democratic body politic, became a central organizing feature in Western education (Jaeger, 1970). The curriculum of the Paedia, synthesized in the works of Isocrates, sought to cultivate speech excellence for strategic advocacy in the political and legal forums of the inaugural democracy.

The Isocratean idea that propels through Western education is his synthesis of a revolutionary notion of power: that is, persuasive power. The massive forms of autocratic force that dominated pre-Athenian systems could, for the first time, be supplanted by a skilled speaker. A king can gather an army, but an orator can unite a nation. An aristocrat can invoke favor, but a potent advocate can dismantle entire systems of legal precedence.

Isocrates recognized the capacity of education in light of the fact that the connection between language and justice vitally changes as it moves from autocratic to democratic arenas. Here, influence and not military or aristocratic might can carry the day. Reflecting this new ideal, the curriculum of the Paedia was the first alloy of rhetoric and democracy. A strident emphasis on the disciplined study of speech advocacy was equaled only by the demand that the student employ these skills assertively and morally in the social order. As Grimaldi (1996) explains:

> It was Isocrates who organized the Sophists' views on rhetorical education into a reasonable system integrating their ideas on doxa, subject matter, and the ultimate objective, arete [excellence in the social order]. His goal was ethical as well as political instruction assisted by the power of logos as organizational principle. By logos he meant rhetoric... or as he called his education... a making of the cultivated, informed, responsible mind able to communicate with others on matters of the polis and morality.

The Paidea is the first articulation in education theory of praxis, or combining theory and practice in relationship to the body politic. Action without instruction is vacant--while instruction without implementation is inert. Arete, or symbolic excellence vis-à-vis the democratic polis was the guiding ideal of the Paideia, and instruction in rhetoric (or Speech) was the organizing principle. Here, excellence is defined within a capacity and participatory framework. The student as speaker was educated to advocate (in as effective a manner as possible) positions to audiences that would determine the weight of the argument in relation to the democratic order. In addition, the curriculum of the Paideia demanded that the

student have a full rounded education in law, politics, and performance (Poulakos & Poulakos, 1999).

Yet, the vision outlined in the Paideia ran into quick resistance by an aristocracy fearful of relinquishing their power to the people. Plato's Republic, which eerily prefigures our own, is guided by the notion that demos kratos--the rule of the people--is inherently unstable and open to the possibilities of inane majority decisions (Johnston, 1996). As such, we find a ruling class of (ostensibly) moral and wise leaders. The Isocratean Paedeia spawned the liberal arts and shaped the western model of education. Yet, it is Plato's elite republic that triumphed as the dominant political model of the West. One outcome of this trend has been the historical subordination of rhetoric to the interests of political elitism, philosophy and science. As a result, the rhetorical education has been stripped of its political potential and instead, has been cast as a skills discipline made to serve the dominant ideological goals of the day. And Western history now details how democracy as a viable form of government was a project that was subverted for 2000 years (Tarnas, 1991).

Dewey and Democratic Education

The notion of democratic education vis-à-vis communication would be exhumed in the early 20th century in the works of the great democratic education theorists. Drawing upon the ideas of the early modern democratic thinkers, the progressive theorists embraced the idea that democracy demands education (e.g., Tozer et al, 1993). It was held that in order for a democracy to work its citizens must be educated enough to recognize and express their own interests. This fits the critic/mimic view described above: that democracy demands an informed citizenry.

John Dewey agreed with this notion but saw its converse as more true. For Dewey, a democratic education is the most rich form of education because it provides a platform for people to vivify their potential as they cultivate their interests in relation to the democratic body politic. Simply put, the most effective form of education is defined through democratic action. Thus for education to be most effective, it is necessary that people partake in democratic forms of life. The logical outcome of this belief is that democracy should be emulated in the classroom. Dewey (1920) states, for example, that the democratic:

> ... test of all the institutions of adult life is their effect in furthering continued education... Democracy has many meanings, but if it has a moral meaning, it is found in resolving that the supreme test of all political institutions and industrial arrangements shall be to the contribution they make to the all-around growth of every member of society.

Dewey believed that traditional education was flawed in many ways, the most notable here being that it acclimated students to a democracy that resided in the institutions of its governmental structure. In contrast, Dewey claimed that any situation within the social order which held the promise of cooperative decision making was a democratic event. Traditional civic education suggests that government is a set of objective institutions about which we must learn and respond to: the three branches of government, the Constitution, the Bill of Rights etc. Yet, this view deflects focus from the pervasive, deliberative nature of democracy. In this sense, democracy is ubiquitous across interactions.

This radical notion functioned to move democracy out of the realm of cognition into the predicaments in which predicaments in which people find themselves. This philosophy brings the notions and practices of discussion and deliberative situations to the forefront in education (e.g., Keith, 2002). Simply put, democracy resides not in institutional structure but

in discourse. The subsequent prescription is that education should focus less on memorizing institutional structure and procedures and more on examining the discursive practices which personify the very notion of democracy itself.

Dewey's disenchantment with traditional education led him to an important insight. He understood that people are less likely to be intrigued by knowledge in which they have no vested interest. People desire to learn, but not from a predetermined curriculum that seeks merely to foist knowledge upon them. Instead, if people are allowed to seek out and cultivate their own interests, then their natural desire and capacity for knowledge will come to life. For Dewey, this is most true in a democracy because it is here that one finds the best possibilities of cultivating individual interests in relation to democratic publics that embody the content of those interests (e.g., Tozer et al, 1993).

Dewey's ideas had a significant impact on both democratic theory as well as on the fabric of education curriculum that followed him. Yet, at the same time, Dewey's dream was eviscerated as education theorissts ignored the possibilities of actual student participation in the democratic body politic. Post-Deweyan ideas that permeate education theory encourage instead the idea that the school should be where students learn about and (possibly) emulate democracy. This project is effective to an extent. The classroom is undoubtedly a primary arena in which students should learn about civics and government. Yet, where this idea fails is where it ignores the possibilities inherent in dissolving the distinction between the education arena and the democratic order. Instead of viewing the classroom as the sole space wherein students gain knowledge about—and emulate --democratic forms of life, there must be an active project that systematically integrates students into the democratic order. This argument is a recent and still marginal thesis in democratic education theory: that is, that one of the prime functions of schooling is to compel students to identify and explore their civic interests within the democratic order itself. This notion of participatory education is outlined in the ensuing section.

Rhetoric, Praxis and Civics

The curriculum tendered in this project calls for a more strident view of participatory democracy and civics education than is outlined in conventional civics standards. First, the notion of government must be extended beyond the traditional view of dominant political institutions to include all forums of interaction wherein decisions are made cooperatively. That is, the notion of democracy as something that takes place only in traditional political forums and voting booths should be broadly extended to include all public arenas of deliberative interaction. Second, the civics standards project must be transformed from the critic/mimic view that governs civic education to a critical/participatory view propelled by a civics-as-rhetoric curriculum. The ensuing section outlines these broad ideas.

A civics-as-rhetoric curriculum entails three primary features: academic pedagogy, participatory civics, and praxis rhetoric. The project invites students to gain knowledge and skills in the classroom while concurrently implementing this knowledge/skills base in the democratic order. The program requires the school system to play a major role in integrating the student-citizen into the body politic. Here, the student gains structural knowledge of the democratic system within the classroom, infiltrates local democratic forums based on personal passions and local needs and employs rhetoric as an organizing principle in these settings.

The notion of academic pedagogy is based on the idea that the classroom is one proper space to acclimate students to formal notions of democracy, citizenship and rhetoric. The idea here is somewhat analogous to the conventional civics standards project in that it entails teaching the student the formal lexicon and material structure of democracy. As such, the student is apprised of the formal texture of the U.S. government, its civic outlets and their governing laws, procedures and ideas. In addition, the student gains knowledge and skills in the area of rhetoric as a method of crafting and critiquing influence in cooperation with others who inhabit shared civic outlets.

In the civics-as-rhetoric curriculum, academic pedagogy is tied to participatory civics. That is, the student is directly involved in the political arena— not as an observer, but as a viable player. Such arenas can include traditional political outlets, but should also include any civic outlet in alignment with the student's passions. This connection to the democratic body is just as important as the academic pedagogy phase. It is crucial that the student-citizen cultivate a vested interest in the body politic as a forum to apply the knowledge/skill base gleaned in the academic forum. Here, as Barber (1984) states, "knowledge and the quest for knowledge tend to follow rather than precede political engagement: give people some significant power and they will quickly appreciate the need for knowledge, but foist knowledge on them without giving them responsibility and they will display only indifference." (p.234).

A civic-rhetoric education seeks to locate the student's interest and energy within the local arena. Citizens of the constitutional republic are citizens of local environments and, as such, their interests and rhetorical skills must be tied to those local arenas. In a liberal democracy, citizens are encouraged to cultivate their private monetary interests and, given any leftover time and energy, to participate in local outlets such as the PTA or the city council. The result is minimal civic participation. Civics-as-rhetoric, however, seeks to expand the skill, energy and interest base of the population to cultivate widespread civic activity among the population.

Student-citizens are both encouraged and equipped to translate their private interests to the public sphere. The engine of such movement are the practices of rhetoric. The more common local spheres students become members of, the more they will see how their interests overlap with other members of their community. Put another way, the more one resides in the private, the less one can see the legitimacy of various publics. Barber (1984) holds this project to be essential to democracy proper because local civic arenas are what keep the tenuous balance between the people and the federal government that is necessary for a strong democracy. De Tocqueville (1960) held that direct civic participation addresses two vital problems. First, it cultivates intense interest for the civic order among students as they cultivate their actual political interests. Simply put, student-citizens will desire intense participation as it provides them with the most viable path for control over their own lives. Second, it provides the masses with the proper tools to rule themselves— a project necessary to overcome elitist objections concerning the inability of the people to rule themselves.

The discipline of rhetoric is the most viable of disciplines to activate the project outlined here for two reasons. First, because, as Dewey claims, democracy is discursive and not institutional, then the civic education curriculum should reflect a primarily discursive orientation. Simply put, democracy resides at the intersections of interactions. Given this, civics as a primarily symbolic oriented project should be the focus. Second, because the capacity to craft and critique interest-serving activity is the engine the runs democracy, then the discipline is most suited as the primary area of study. As such, the current project announces the vital need for rhetoric to be integrated into the broad Civics training of

secondary teachers and K-12 students— a project that entails both revising and combining Civics and Speech standards. This approach recognizes that democracy and rhetoric are co-extensive, and this project will produce a sphere of critically active citizens.

Speech Teacher Education

The current project has called for a revaluation of the position of speech/rhetoric within the current standards movement in K-12 education. This re-orientation mandates a new vision of Speech education. In order to centralize rhetoric within the civics standards project, Speech teachers must be trained in ways much different from current methods. The ensuing section suggests four basic revisions in current Speech-education curriculum.

First, pre-service Speech teachers must be well grounded in the content of the social sciences. Current curricular requirements function to acclimate the speech candidate to the social sciences only within general education curriculum. The outcome is that Speech candidates take only a few low level classes in this area. The civics-as-rhetoric curriculum mandates that candidates be well versed (at a minimum) in the areas of history, political science, economics and civics. As such, curriculum should be revised such that candidates have a rich knowledge base in these basic areas.

Second, Speech teacher candidates must have a strong working knowledge of rhetorical theory and the centrality of rhetoric in civic education. Broad current curriculum requires candidates to take only a few courses in the area of influence and persuasion. The outcome is that candidates tend to focus on the speech curriculum that they will be teaching once they are in-service. As such, the secondary education arena is replete with teachers who are well versed only in the areas of basic speech composition and performance and forensics (if they are required to teach in this area). Ancillary content areas such interviewing, oral interpretation and theater might be de-emphasized so that candidates can focus their curriculum more intensely on the theory and practices of rhetoric vis-à-vis civic education.

Third, current forensics curriculum at the K-12 level should be extended beyond the current requirements (at best, current curricula include a forensics club and a one class forensics requirement). Much of what forensics education has to offer is directly applicable to the civics project outline herein. Forensic capacity must be extended throughout general K-12 curricula, and not colonized to mere language arts departments (which in reality view forensic education as ancillary to more core curriculum.

Finally, teacher candidates in Speech should embody the principles of a civics-as-rhetoric curriculum as they themselves are involved in civic forums. The civics-rhetoric project mandates that student-citizens be stridently integrated into the civic order. The primary facilitators of this process are their teachers. This process mandates that teachers are well versed not only in the content of civic-rhetoric education, but in both the practices of civic integration and avenues of civic forums as well. The fact that teachers are those who know through experience how to maneuver through and engender influence within the civic arena will function positively in two ways. First, teachers and teacher candidates will know the structural intricacies of civic outlets— knowledge that will enable them to be effective facilitators for students in these same arenas. Second, teachers and teacher candidates who are actively involved in the civic arena will inspire students as they visibly embody the concepts that they teach.

Current civics education will function merely to reproduce the existing liberal order. Students will be adept at analyzing a government system u\in which they have little vested interest. Activating a civics-as-rhetoric curriculum will prompt a population both anxious and capable ruling themselves.

Provided below is a tentative set of standards which might guide a civics-as-rhetoric curriculum.

Civics-as-Rhetoric Standards

STANDARD 1: Students are trained to be active rhetoricians.

1.1 Students cultivate an understanding of the nature and history of rhetoric.

1.2 Students understand rhetoric as they actively employ it in a variety of political, economic and cultural outlets.

1.3 Students are active critics--both in and outside the classroom--of how people and institutions use strategic communication to serve a range of interests.

STANDARD 2: Students as rhetoricians critically engage the civic sphere.

2.1 Students identify and engage political, economic and cultural arenas that they believe are important .

2.2 Students employ rhetorical theory and strategy to engender influence within these arenas.

2.3 Students-as rhetoricians examine and engage democracy— in both idea and practice.

2.4 Students assess and comment socially on the relationship between symbolic activity and power in the social order.

STANDARD 3: Students identify, advocate and critique a diversity of positions in relation to salient social issues.

3.1 Students examine, value and advocate a range of opposing opinions, instead of passively perpetuating a dominant and monolithic ideology.

Bibliography

Barber, B. *Strong Democracy: Participatory Politics for a New Age* (U of CA Press: Berkeley, CA): 1984.

Barbour, C. & Wright, G.C., *Keeping the Republic: Power and Citizenship in American Politics* (Boston: Houghton Mifflen Co.): 2002.

Bowles, S. & Gintis, H. "Preface to the Political Economy of a Postliberal Democracy," in Shapiuro, H. S. & Purpel, D.E. (Eds.) "*Critical Social Issues in American Education* (New York: Longmon): 1993.

Boyer, E. *Scholarship Reconsidered: Priorities of the Professoriate* (Princeton, NJ: The Carnegie Foundation): 1990.

Dewey, J. *Reconstruction in Philosophy* (Boston: Beacon Press 1920/1984): 186.

Eisner, E.W. "Standards for American Schools: Help or Hindrance? *Phi Delta Kappan 78* (1995): 758-764.

Galston, W. "Civic Education in the Liberal State," in Rorty, A.O. (Ed.) *Philosophers on Education* (Routledge: New York 1998): 470-480.

Grimaldi, W.M. "How Do We Get from Corax-Tisias to Plato-Aristotle in Greek Rhetorical Theory," in C.L. Johnstone (Ed.) *Theory, Text, Context: Issues in Greek Rhetoric and Oratory* (Albany, NY: State University of New York Press 1996): 38-39.

Gutmann, A. *Democratic Education* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press): 1987.

Hunt, S.K., Simonds, C.H., & Cooper, P.J.. "Communication and Teacher Education," *Communication Education*, 51 2002): 81-94.

Jaeger, Werner *Paideia: The Ideals of Greek Culture* Vol. 1 Translation: Gilbert Highet (New York: Oxford University Press): 1970.

Johnston, I.. *Ideologies: An Analytic and Contextual Approach* (Orchard Park, NY: Broadview Press 1996): 118-148.

Johnson, S.D. & Roelke, C.F. "Secondary teachers' and undergraduate education faculty members' perceptions of teaching effectiveness criteria: A National Survey," *Communication Education 48* (1999): 127-138.

National Standards for Civics and Government: Center for Civic Education
www.civiced.org/stds www.civiced.org/912toc.htm

Poulakos, J. & Poulakos, T *Classical Rhetorical Theory* (New York: Houghton Mifflin Company): 1999.

Schultz, J. *The Democracy Owner's Manual: A Practical Guide to Changing the World* (New Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers University Press): 2002.

Stanley, W.B. & Nelson, J.L. "The Foundations of Social Education in Historical Context," in Martusewicz, R. & Reynolds, W.M. (Eds.) *Inside/Out: Contemporary Critical Perspectives in Education* (New York: St. Martin's Press 1994): 265-284.

Tarnas, R. *The Passion of the Western Mind* (New York: Ballentine Books 1991): 318-320.

Tozer, S.E., Violas, P.C. & Senese, G. *School and Society: Educational Practice as Social Expression* (New York: McGraw Hill) 1993.

Verdeber, R.F. *Speech for Effective Communication* (Austin, TX: Holt, Rinehart & Winston): 1999.

CS 512 442

U.S. Department of Education
Office of Educational Research and Improvement (OERI)
National Library of Education (NLE)
Educational Resources Information Center (ERIC)
Reproduction Release (Specific Document)

ERIC

I. DOCUMENT IDENTIFICATION:

Title: Teaching the Pedagogy of Civic Action: Toward a Rhetorical Democratic Pedagogy	
Author(s): David L. Palmer	
Corporate Source:	Publication Date: 11/02

II. REPRODUCTION RELEASE:

In order to disseminate as widely as possible timely and significant materials of interest to the educational community, documents announced in the monthly abstract journal of the ERIC system, Resources in Education (RIE), are usually made available to users in microfiche, reproduced paper copy, and electronic media, and sold through the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS). Credit is given to the source of each document, and, if reproduction release is granted, one of t following notices is affixed to the document.

If permission is granted to reproduce and disseminate the identified document, please CHECK ONE of the following three options and sign in the indicated space following.

The sample sticker shown below will be affixed to all Level 1 documents	The sample sticker shown below will be affixed to all Level 2A documents	The sample sticker shown below will be affixed to all Level 2B documents
PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY SAMPLE TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)	PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL IN MICROFICHE, AND IN ELECTRONIC MEDIA FOR ERIC COLLECTION SUBSCRIBERS ONLY, HAS BEEN GRANTED BY SAMPLE TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)	PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL IN MICROFICHE ONLY HAS BEEN GRANTED BY SAMPLE TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
Level 1	Level 2A	Level 2B
☑	☐	☐
Check here for Level 1 release, permitting reproduction and dissemination in microfiche or other ERIC archival media (e.g. electronic) and paper copy.	Check here for Level 2A release, permitting reproduction and dissemination in microfiche and in electronic media for ERIC archival collection subscribers only	Check here for Level 2B release, permitting reproduction and dissemination in microfiche only

Documents will be processed as indicated provided reproduction quality permits.
If permission to reproduce is granted, but no box is checked, documents will be processed at Level 1.

I hereby grant to the Educational Resources Information Center (ERIC) nonexclusive permission to reproduce and disseminate this document as indicated above. Reproduction from the ERIC microfiche, or electronic media by persons other than ERIC employees and its system contractors requires permission from the copyright holder. Exception is made for non-profit reproduction by libraries and other service agencies to satisfy information needs of educators in response to discrete inquiries.

Signature:	Printed Name/Position/Title: David L. Palmer Asst. Professor
Organization/Address: Dept. of Speech Communication, Univ. of Northern Colorado Greeley, CO 80639	Telephone: 970.351.1800 Fax:
	E-mail Address: david.palmer@unco.edu Date: 9/25/03

III. DOCUMENT AVAILABILITY INFORMATION (FROM NON-ERIC SOURCE):

If permission to reproduce is not granted to ERIC, or, if you wish ERIC to cite the availability of the document from another

III. DOCUMENT AVAILABILITY INFORMATION (FROM NON-ERIC SOURCE):

If permission to reproduce is not granted to ERIC, or, if you wish ERIC to cite the availability of the document from another source, please provide the following information regarding the availability of the document. (ERIC will not announce a document unless it is publicly available, and a dependable source can be specified. Contributors should also be aware that ERIC selection criteria are significantly more stringent for documents that cannot be made available through EDRS.)

Publisher/Distributor:
Address:
Price:

IV. REFERRAL OF ERIC TO COPYRIGHT/REPRODUCTION RIGHTS HOLDER:

If the right to grant this reproduction release is held by someone other than the addressee, please provide the appropriate name and address:

Name:
Address:

V. WHERE TO SEND THIS FORM:

Send this form to the following ERIC Clearinghouse:

However, if solicited by the ERIC Facility, or if making an unsolicited contribution to ERIC, return this form (and the document being contributed) to:

ERIC Processing and Reference Facility
4483-A Forbes Boulevard
Lanham, Maryland 20706

Telephone: 301-552-4200
Toll Free: 800-799-3742
FAX: 301-552-4700
e-mail: info@ericfac.piccard.csc.com
WWW: http://ericfacility.org